

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 4, 2009, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

By this Response, claims 10, 20, 29-30, and 41 have been amended to more particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claim 29-30 may be found in the specification, for example, at paragraphs 29-30 and 93, which disclose a controller. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a controller is typically equipped with a “processor,” a “memory,” and “computer program code.” Claims 1-33 and 35-41 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 29, and 37-41 are independent claims.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections to the claims for the reasons discussed below.

As a threshold matter, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action is deficient because it is incomplete. The Office Action neither mentioned nor rejected claims 39-41, which were added in the previous Response dated November 4, 2008. However, under MPEP 707.07(i), “In every Office action, each pending claim should be mentioned by number, and its treatment or status given.” In this case, it is clear that the Office Action failed to mention claims 39-41, which were added in the previous Response, and to give their treatment or status. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that

the Office Action is improper because it is incomplete, and respectfully request that, if claims 39-41 are rejected, the rejection(s) be in a new non-final Office Action.

Interview Summary

Both Applicants and the undersigned respectfully thank the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview on June 25, 2009. The following comments are submitted in view of the Examiner interview of June 25, 2009. If the Examiner has further questions and/or concerns, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 15, and 20-21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims from which claims 7, 15, and 20-21 depend are also allowable, as discussed below. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 7, 15, and 20-21 be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 7, 15, and 20-21 are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Further, as discussed during the interview, the allowable subject matter from claims 7, 15, and 20-21 has been included in pending independent claims 39-41. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that each of independent claims 39-41 recites allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3, 22-23, and 26-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,233,628 of Rappaport et al. ("Rappaport"). As discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-3, 23, 26-33, and 35-38 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in Rappaport. Claim 34 was cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer in the Response dated April 30, 2008. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 34 is moot in view of the claim cancellation, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

As a threshold matter, and as discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action is improper because it rejected claim 22 as allegedly being anticipated by Rappaport yet admitted that Rappaport does not anticipate the claim (*see* Office Action at page 14), as discussed in the previous Response dated November 4, 2008, at page 15, third paragraph. The Office Action acknowledged, "Regarding claim 22, the previous office action mislabeled the heading statement of the prior art [and the] typo has been corrected" (*see* Office Action at page 2, item 1).

However, the typo has not been corrected, as this rejection still includes the improper rejection of claim 22. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the typo be corrected, and that this rejection no longer includes the improper rejection of claim 22, in a new non-final Office Action.

Independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-28 depend, is directed to a method including determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches of a transmitter.

Independent claim 29, upon which claims 30-33 and 35-36 depend, is directed to an apparatus including a processor, and a memory including computer program code, the memory and the computer program code configured to, with the processor, cause the apparatus at least to establish estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches, and determine, in an operational entity of a communications network, transmit diversity branches for use based on the estimated channel properties.

Independent claim 37 is directed to an apparatus including establishing means for establishing estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches. The apparatus also includes determining means for determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, transmit diversity branches for use based on the estimated channel properties.

Independent claim 38 is directed to a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium, the computer readable medium storing code including computer

executable instructions configured to perform determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches of a transmitter.

Independent claim 39 is directed to a method including determining at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches of a transmitter. The determining includes determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on the estimated channel properties including expected powers of transmit diversity branches. The determining includes evaluating a transmit diversity performance indicator using the expected powers. The determining includes calculating the transmit diversity performance indicator using a

formula including $\mu_k = k \sqrt{F_0 \prod_{m=1}^k \lambda_m}$, where F_0 denotes a required outage probability, λ_m

denotes an expected power of an m-th transmit diversity branch in a transmit diversity branch set Θ , and Θ is a number of transmit diversity branch indexes in the transmit diversity branch set Θ .

Independent claim 40 is directed to a method including determining at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches of a transmitter. The determining includes determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on the estimated channel properties including second order statistics of channel coefficients of transmit diversity branches. The determining includes using the second order statistics including at least one

correlation matrix calculated using estimated channel coefficients. The determining includes calculating the transmit diversity performance indicator using a formula including $\mu_{\Theta} = \sqrt[|\Theta|]{F_0 \prod_{m=1}^{|\Theta|} u_m}$, where F_0 denotes a required outage probability, u_m denotes an m-th Eigenvalue of a correlation matrix relating to a transmit diversity branch set Θ , and Θ is a number of transmit diversity branch indexes in the transmit diversity branch set Θ .

Independent claim 41 is directed to a method including determining at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches of a transmitter. The determining includes determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on the estimated channel properties including second order statistics of channel coefficients of transmit diversity branches. The method also includes constructing virtual transmit branches as linear combinations of physical transmit diversity branches. The estimated channel properties include expected powers of the virtual transmit branches. The determining includes determining the at least one transmit diversity branch using a transmit diversity performance indicator defining a branch power threshold to add a further virtual transmit branch set for use, the branch power threshold being dependent on the expected powers of the virtual transmit branches already selected to the virtual transmit branch set for use.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of any of the presently pending claims.

Rappaport describes a communications stimulation system that allows a user to perform a quantitative or subjective test of digital baseband devices over wireless channels using actual measured or modeled propagation data. The digital wireless communication simulation system is capable of simulating the transient nature of channels and radio hardware so that loss of synchronization can be included in the simulation (*see* Rappaport at Abstract).

However, Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. The Office Action asserted these features are disclosed by Rappaport at Figure 3 and column 16, lines 20-34. In the cited portion, Rappaport describes a channel model used in conjunction with a hardware baseband simulator to evaluate the performance of various baseband platforms using equalization, coding, or diversity approaches before implementing such capabilities in an actual prototype.

However, Rappaport does not disclose or suggest determining, in an operational entity of a communication network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of multiple transmit diversity branches. Accordingly, Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, **in an operational entity of a communications network**, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” (emphasis

added) as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. Specifically, Rappaport refers to evaluating the performance of digital radio communications systems in a laboratory (*see* Rappaport at column 1, lines 8-15), not in an operational entity of a communication network. As clearly supported in the specification at Figure 1 and its associated discussion, the operational entity of the communication network of the claimed invention may correspond, for example, to a base station controller (BSC) 14 or a base station (BS) 16 (*see* Specification at paragraph 30). Rappaport does not even mention such operational entities of a communication network.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 29, and 37-41. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 29, and 37-41 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 23, 26-28, 30-33, and 35-36 depend from, and further limit, independent claims 1 and 29. Thus, each of claims 2-3, 23, 26-28, 30-33, and 35-36 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in Rappaport. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 2-3, 23, 26-28, 30-33, and 35-36 be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 23, 26-33, and 35-38 are, thus, respectfully submitted.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rappaport in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,956 of Veeravalli et al. (“Veeravalli”). The Office Action acknowledged that Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 4, and cited Veeravalli to remedy the deficiencies of Rappaport with respect to these rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Rappaport and Veeravalli.

In order for this rejection to be sustainable, the combination of Rappaport and Veeravalli must teach all the recitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 over Rappaport are incorporated herein to support the patentability of dependent claim 4. Thus, it is respectfully requested that dependent claim 4 be allowed. Veeravalli fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport.

Veeravalli describes calculation of the probability of outage for a cell within a CDMA network utilized to relate cell coverage to cell capacity. Based on a desired probability of outage, the coverage of the cell may be calculated for an average number of users within the cell (*see* Veeravalli at Abstract).

However, Veeravalli fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport. Similarly to Rappaport, Veeravalli fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” as recited in

independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. Veeravalli is silent as to teaching the particular features associated with the determining of independent claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Rappaport and Veeravalli would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the features of the determining as recited in independent claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and related dependent claim 4 are not obvious over the combination of Rappaport and Veeravalli.

Claims 5-6, 8, and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rappaport in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,524,275 of Lindell ("Lindell"). The Office Action acknowledged that Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 5-6, 8, and 10-11, and cited Lindell to remedy the deficiencies of Rappaport with respect to these rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-6, 8, and 10-11 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Rappaport and Lindell.

In order for this rejection to be sustainable, the combination of Rappaport and Lindell must teach all the recitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 over Rappaport are incorporated herein to support the patentability of dependent claims 5-6, 8, and 10-11. Thus, it is respectfully requested that dependent claims 5-6, 8, and 10-11 be allowed. Lindell fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport.

Lindell describes a radio transmitter output power controller which automatically restricts the maximum transmitting time during an averaging time so that the average power remains below an acceptable level. The maximum transmitter output power may be automatically reduced to a lower level if and when a predetermined average power level is approached (*see* Lindell at Abstract).

However, Lindell fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport. Similarly to Rappaport, Lindell fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. Lindell is silent as to teaching the particular features associated with the determining of independent claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Rappaport and Lindell would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the features of the determining as recited in independent claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and related dependent claims 5-6, 8, and 10-11 are not obvious over the combination of Rappaport and Lindell.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rappaport in view of Lindell and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,283 of Conklin (“Conklin”). The Office Action acknowledged that the combination of Rappaport and Lindell fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 9, and cited Conklin to

remedy the deficiencies of the combination of Rappaport and Lindell with respect to these rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Rappaport, Lindell, and Conklin.

In order for this rejection to be sustainable, the combination of Rappaport, Lindell, and Conklin must teach all the recitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 over the combination of Rappaport and Lindell are incorporated herein to support the patentability of dependent claim 9. Thus, it is respectfully requested that dependent claim 9 be allowed. Conklin fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Rappaport and Lindell.

Conklin describes a cluster processing system that determines at least one focal node on a hierarchically arranged tree structure of nodes based on attributes of a data set. The data set comprises a plurality of data set attributes with associated weight values. The cluster processing system selects a set of nodes from the tree structure with tree structure attributes that correspond with the data set attributes, and then assigns quantitative values to nodes in the set of nodes from the weight values in the data set. At least one cluster of nodes are selected, based on proximity in the tree structure, and at least one focal node on the tree structure for the cluster of nodes is selected. (*see* Conklin at Abstract).

However, Conklin fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Rappaport and Lindell. Similarly to the combination of Rappaport and Lindell, Conklin fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. Conklin is silent as to teaching the particular features associated with the determining of independent claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Rappaport, Lindell, and Conklin would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the features of the determining as recited in independent claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and related dependent claim 9 are not obvious over the combination of Rappaport, Lindell, and Conklin.

Claims 12-14, 16, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rappaport in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,649 of Mitra et al. (“Mitra”). The Office Action acknowledged that Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 12-14, 16, and 18-19, and cited Mitra to remedy the deficiencies of Rappaport with respect to these rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-14, 16, and 18-19 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Rappaport and Mitra.

In order for this rejection to be sustainable, the combination of Rappaport and Mitra must teach all the recitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments

presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 over Rappaport are incorporated herein to support the patentability of dependent claims 12-14, 16, and 18-19. Thus, it is respectfully requested that dependent claims 12-14, 16, and 18-19 be allowed. Mitra fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport.

Mitra describes a method and apparatus that use a set of parameters characterizing an interference signal at a base unit for determining power levels for signals transmitted from a communications device to the base unit. The set of parameters comprises second or higher order statistics characterizing the interference signal, and the parameters are used to determine a desired power level for signals received at the base unit. The desired power level is communicated to a communications device via a pilot signal transmitted by the base unit at a predetermined level. The predetermined level and the power of the received pilot signal are used to compute a path gain between the base unit and communications device. The path gain and desired power level are then used to determine the power level of signals transmitted from the communications device to the base unit (*see* Mitra at Abstract).

However, Mitra fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport. Similarly to Rappaport, Mitra fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. Mitra is silent

as to teaching the particular features associated with the determining of independent claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Rappaport and Mitra would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the features of the determining as recited in independent claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and related dependent claims 12-14, 16, and 18-19 are not obvious over the combination of Rappaport and Mitra.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rappaport in view of Mitra and further in view of Conklin. The Office Action acknowledged that the combination of Rappaport and Mitra fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 17, and cited Conklin to remedy the deficiencies of the combination of Rappaport and Mitra with respect to these rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Rappaport, Mitra, and Conklin.

In order for this rejection to be sustainable, the combination of Rappaport, Mitra, and Conklin must teach all the recitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 over the combination of Rappaport and Mitra are incorporated herein to support the patentability of dependent claim 17. Thus, it is respectfully requested that dependent claim 17 be allowed. Conklin fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Rappaport and Mitra.

Similarly to the combination of Rappaport and Mitra, Conklin fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. Conklin is silent as to teaching the particular features associated with the determining of independent claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Rappaport, Mitra, and Conklin would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the features of the determining as recited in independent claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and related dependent claim 17 are not obvious over the combination of Rappaport, Mitra, and Conklin.

Claims 22 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rappaport in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,411 of Whinnett et al. (“Whinnett”). The Office Action acknowledged that Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 22 and 24-25, and cited Whinnett to remedy the deficiencies of Rappaport with respect to these rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-25 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Rappaport and Whinnett.

As a threshold matter, and as discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action is legally improper because it is incomplete. 37 C.F.R. 1.104(b) explicitly requires, “The examiner’s action will be complete as to all

matters.” “In order to provide a complete application file history and to enhance the clarity of the prosecution history record, an examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application” (*see* MPEP 707.07(f)). However, the Office Action failed to cite the portions of Whinnett that allegedly teach the features of claim 22 (*see* Office Action at page 13). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action is deficient because it does not provide a clear explanation of the rejection of claim 22, as required by the MPEP. During the interview, it was acknowledged that this rejection of claim 22 was a typo. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the typo be corrected, and that this rejection no longer includes the improper rejection of claim 22, in a new non-final Office Action.

In order for this rejection to be sustainable, the combination of Rappaport and Whinnett must teach all the recitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 over Rappaport are incorporated herein to support the patentability of dependent claims 24-25. Thus, it is respectfully requested that dependent claims 24-25 be allowed. Whinnett fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport.

Whinnett describes a method for wireless data communication between a base station and a subscriber unit in a wireless communication system. Groups of symbols of an input data stream are commutated to produce a plurality of commutated data streams. The plurality of commutated data streams are then transformed to produce a plurality of transformed data streams. Next, each transformed data stream is spread with a selected

one of a plurality of spreading codes to produce a plurality of antenna signals. Finally, each of the plurality of antenna signals is transmitted using a selected one of a plurality of spaced apart antennas, wherein the plurality of spaced apart antennas are spaced apart to provide transmit diversity. In one embodiment, the transform is a space-time transform (*see* Whinnett at Abstract).

However, Whinnett fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport. Similarly to Rappaport, Whinnett fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. Whinnett is silent as to teaching the particular features associated with the determining of independent claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Rappaport and Whinnett would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the features of the determining as recited in independent claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and related dependent claims 24-25 are not obvious over the combination of Rappaport and Whinnett.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rappaport in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,368 of Brunner (“Brunner”). The Office Action acknowledged that Rappaport fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 22, and cited Brunner to remedy the deficiencies of Rappaport with respect to

these rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of Rappaport and Brunner.

In order for this rejection to be sustainable, the combination of Rappaport and Brunner must teach all the recitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 over Rappaport are incorporated herein to support the patentability of dependent claim 22. Thus, it is respectfully requested that dependent claim 22 be allowed. Brunner fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport.

Brunner describes a method that controls the downlink beam in a radio communication system. The radio communication system has an antenna system with several antenna elements. The method involves a) examining a received uplink signal sent by a transmitter for the existence of phase correlations between parts of the uplink signal received from various antenna elements of the antenna system, and b) if a phase correlation is detected, assigning at least one source direction to the uplink signal and sending the downlink signal in the source direction. If a phase correlation is not detected, however, the downlink signal is sent in a non-directional manner in the form of several components produced using at least one diversity technique (*see* Brunner at Abstract).

However, Brunner fails to cure the deficiencies of Rappaport. Similarly to Rappaport, Brunner fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “determining, in an operational entity of a communications network, at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches” as recited in

independent claim 1 and similarly recited in the other independent claims. Brunner is silent as to teaching the particular features associated with the determining of independent claim 1.

Therefore, the combination of Rappaport and Brunner would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the features of the determining as recited in independent claim 1. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and related dependent claim 22 are not obvious over the combination of Rappaport and Brunner.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 4-6, 8-14, 16-19, 22, and 24-25 are, thus, respectfully submitted.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is thus respectfully requested that all of claims 1-33 and 35-41 be allowed, and that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, Applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Loren H. Tung
Registration No. 64,236

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

LHT:skl

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
Check No. 21010